

WI.3
WI.3-3

MEMORANDUM

TO: FILE

DATE May 18 1990

FROM: D. TENKAY

SUBJECT:

SITE NAME: Besley-Wells Co. ALTERNATE NAME: Besley Products Co.

CITY: Beloit, WI STATE: WI 100 Redburn Ave
South Beloit

OWNER(S)

Past: _____ Current: _____
Owner contacted ☐ yes ☒ no; if yes, date contacted _____

TYPE OF OPERATION

☒ Research & Development

- ☐ Production scale testing
☒ Pilot Scale
☐ Bench Scale Process
☐ Theoretical Studies
☐ Sample & Analysis

☒ Facility Type

- ☒ Manufacturing
☐ University
☐ Research Organization
☐ Government Sponsored Facility
☐ Other _____

- ☐ Production
☐ Disposal/Storage

Cutting tool manufacturers

TYPE OF CONTRACT

- ☐ Prime
☒ Subcontractor Proposal
☐ Purchase Order

- ☐ Other information (i.e., cost + fixed fee, unit price, time & material, etc) _____

Contract/Purchase Order # N40 AT(30-1)-1156

CONTRACTING PERIOD: April 1, 1953 thru July 31, 1953

OWNERSHIP:

	AEC/MED OWNED	AEC/MED LEASED	GOVT OWNED	GOVT LEASED	CONTRACTOR OWNED	CONTRACTOR LEASED
LANDS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUILDINGS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EQUIPMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ORE OR RAW MATL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FINAL PRODUCT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
WASTE & RESIDUE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

There is insufficient data to conclude whether test was completed

AEC/MED INVOLVEMENT AT SITE

Control

- ☐ AEC/MED managed operations
- ☐ AEC/MED responsible for accountability
- ☐ AEC/MED overviewed operations
- ☐ Contractor had total control
- ☒ unknown

Health Physics Protection

- ☐ Little or None
- ☐ AEC/MED responsibility
- ☐ Contractor responsibility

MATERIALS HANDLED:

Type (on basis of records reviewed)

- ☐ No Radioactive
- ☒ Natural Radioactive from Feed Materials Production
 - ☐ Ore
 - ☒ Refined Source Material
 - ☐ Residue
- ☐ Natural Radioactive Material from Non-Nuclear Activities
- ☐ Man-Made

Other

Comment

There is no information to suggest whether the planned activity was conducted. The planned test ~~device~~ was sized for 500 slug trial lot of (1-slug) (possibly split between two processes) using a Becking double spinell wet grinder.

Quantities (on the basis of records reviewed)

- ☐ None
- ☐ Production Quantities
- ☒ Small Amounts

Comment

The pilot scale test of equipment was intended to demonstrate a process to increase FMPC productivity by 50-148/slug.

OTHER PERTINENT FACTS:

- ☐ Facility was Licensed
 - ☐ During AEC/MED-Related Operations
 - ☐ For Similar Activities
 - ☐ For Other Activities

Comment

☐ Commercial Production Involving Radioactive Material during AEC/MED Operations

☐ Facility was Decontaminated and Released

☐ Availability of Close Out Records

☒ None

☐ Some

☐ Sufficient

☐ Radioactive Status:

YES

MAYBE

PROBABLY

NOT

Contaminated
Potential for
Exposure
(accessible)

X or unknown

~~NOT~~

X

QUANTITY OF RECORDS AVAILABLE:

☒ Very Little

☐ Some

☐ Sufficient

PROBABILITY OF FINDING ADDITIONAL RECORDS:

☒ Low

☐ Possible

☐ High

RECOMMENDATIONS:

☒ Eliminate

☐ Consider for Remedial Action

☐ Collect More Data

Comment _____

REFERENCES: Plant Assistance and Development Project Proposal and Authorization

SUMMARY

The Bailey Co. is a cutting tool manufacturer. A proposal for ~~conducting~~ a pilot scale test of 500 Uranium chips on a Boring, double spindle wet grinder was approved. No evidence exists as to whether the activity was conducted. [No status or final reports have been found to date]. Recommend elimination based on the low potential for contamination, the uncertainty over whether the activity was ever performed, and the small quantity of Uranium metal involved.